Why Did Dulles Suddenly Change His Tune on Israel? See Page 2.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. III, NO. 33 SEPTEMBER 12, 1955 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Term "Subversive" Has No Place In A Free Society

We are still a long way from seeing the end of the security mania. One of the obstacles to clear thinking is that the critics are under compulsion to demonstrate their own "loyalty" by accepting the premises of the witch hunters. We offer as a horrid example the program of reform put forward by the American Jewish Congress at the recent hearings before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The AJC's were the most detailed liberal proposals for remedying the abuses of the government security program. Some of these proposals are appalling.

Here, for example, is one of the reformed standards suggested by the AJC for determining whether an applicant for a sensitive position is or is not "subversive." The AJC says, "Association with 'front' or other organizations known to be infiltrated with members of subversive groups should only be considered when there is also information as to other activities of the individual which establishes that he may be a part of or sympathetic to the infiltrating element or when he has personal views which are sympathetic to or coincide with subversive lines."

Broad Enough for A McCarthy

This legalistic gibberish is broad enough to cover not only "front" organizations, a vague enough category, but the vaguer one of "infiltrated" groups. Its logic would bar not only Communists and other "subversives" but those whose "personal views . . . are sympathetic to or coincide with subversive lines." Reliability would be measured by political opinion. The door would be opened to close examination of personal views and their judgment by the perniciously nebulous yardstick (nowhere defined and indeed indefinable) of "subversion." Such "reformed" standards are broad enough to accommodate a future McCarthy. They acquiesce in the confusion of loyalty with conformity, security with thought surveillance.

Another example is the AJC's proposed reform of the evils which feed on anonymous accusations. These volunteer Solomons propose, "disclosure and confrontation should be denied the accused employe *only* [italics in original] if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Security Commission or persons delegated by it that (a) the informer sought to be shielded is *currently* [italics also in original] serving as an undercover member of one of the U. S. Government investigation agencies in a strategic position to secure information, or (b) is a person who has participated in the offense and turned against his colleagues but who has remained underground, and (c) the disclosure of the informer's identity would seriously hamper the government's investigative power, and (d) the informer's testimony is the only practical means of proving the government's charge or charges."

This, again, is broad enough to provide a new and firmer legal basis for the evils it proposes to reform. The informer is neither a new phenomena nor one limited to the prosecution of political crimes. The government cannot convict a dope peddler or a jewel smuggler on undisclosed informer testimony; it cannot plead as excuse that to bring the informer forward publicly would destroy his usefulness. Nor can the government convict anyone of political crimes—for treason or sedition or conspiracy to advocate revolutionary doctrine—without producing its informers. Why should it be permitted wider latitude in security cases? Political informers, paid to spy on their associates or betraying their comrades to win immunity for themselves, have never been very reliable creatures. Why should they be allowed the cover of secrecy in hearings which ruin people's reputations and destroy their livelihood?

The Purge We Need

Liberal reforms of this kind, if adopted, would serve only to institutionalize the witch hunt, and to establish it permanently in American life. Once its standards are accepted, with the unspoken premises which lie behind them, it is impossible to keep the security program within reasonable bounds. If certain ideas are so dangerous that those who hold them should be barred from "sensitive" government positions, it is difficult to refute the logic which says that other persons should not be allowed to spread such ideas as teachers, writers, speakers or journalists. If "subversives" are to be barred from government, then why not from plants working on orders from the government? America will not be restored to health until the security program is abolished altogether. A free society cannot operate without real risks; to try and avoid them artificially is to foster graver evils and more serious dangers. The security mania has succeeded in brainwashing a whole generation of American intellectuals. But this is a kind of terror, not effective counter-intelligence.

The purge we need is a purge of American thinking, which has grown foul with alien concepts. The most fundamental of these is that history is made by conspiracies, and that the path to social stability therefore lies in policing political activity in order to stamp out dangerous, "subversive" ideas. But what is regarded as "subversive" in one generation may prove progressive in the next. Among the "subversive" ideas in the Communist Manifesto, for example, were the income tax and the eight hour day. Who but Westbrook Pegler today fails to take them for granted as healthy features of a stable society? Yet these reforms might never have been achieved peacefully if two generations ago there had been a "security" program to drive out of government and opinion-forming professions all who held such "subversive" views.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The $64 Question of Middle Eastern Politics

Why Did Mr. Dulles Suddenly Change His Tune on Israel?

What Secretary of States Dulles meant by his recent speech on the Middle East seems to have everyone in Washington (and no doubt also in Tel Aviv and the Arab capitals) puzzled. The speech offered an international loan with American participation to resettle Arab refugees; American aid in water development for the whole area; and a security guarantee of Arab-Israeli borders. But all this seems to hinge on whether Arabs and Israeli can first agree—a most unlikely event—on where the borders should be.

The Secretary's genius for ambiguity, developed by a lifetime in the practice of corporation law, was never more brilliantly evident than in this carefully drafted speech. At his press conference four days later, he cut short all questions about it, saying he did not think it "wise or proper" to add "anything of substance" to what he had said in the speech. Perhaps it can best be evaluated against certain background developments:

During the past two years Israel has been negotiating in London and Washington for an Anglo-Israeli or U. S.-Israeli military alliance. Its chief argument has been that such an alliance would make the Arab States realize that Israel was here to stay, and thus clear the way for peace between it and the Arab States. These negotiations have been fruitless.

During recent weeks the idea of a U. S.-Israeli military alliance has been taken up by Democratic party circles. W. Averell Harriman, Governor of New York State, said on his return from Israel last month that the peace and stability of the Middle East might best be furthered by a pact between the U. S. and Israel. Congressman Celler expressed the same view in a press conference at Tel Aviv on August 23.

This may become an issue in the 1956 elections. It was politically necessary that the Eisenhower Administration have something constructive to offer. The result may have been the Dulles speech.

A Change of Emphasis

When this speech is compared with earlier pronouncements from the Department of State under Dulles, a change of emphasis is apparent. When Mr. Dulles made his "Report on the Near East" (June 1, 1953) after a visit to the area, the emphasis was on reassuring the Arabs that the U. S., Britain and France by their tripartite declaration of May 25, 1950, were pledged to resist any attempt by Israel to expand. "It must be made clear," the Secretary of State said, "that the present U. S. Administration stands fully behind that Declaration. We cannot afford to be distrusted by millions who could be sturdy friends of freedom."

There was the same emphasis in the Eisenhower Administration's next authoritative exposition of policy. This was the speech made almost a year later, on May 1, 1954, by Henry A. Byroade, then Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs, now U. S. Ambassador to Egypt. The choice of forum was in keeping with the content. He spoke before the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism and called his address "Facing Realities in the Arab-Israeli Dispute." He hinted that one of the realities was to restrict immigration into Israel in order to placate Arab fears of what he called "expansionist Zionism."

An even more bitter pill for Zionist and Jewish opinion was the address made here in Washington last March 6 before the Conference of Jewish Organizations by John D. Jernegan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs. Mr. Jernegan spoke of "Middle East Defense" and he made it quite clear that Israel was to be excluded from America's Middle East defense planning so long as the Arabs were hostile.

Put More Bluntly

The same point of view was expressed more bluntly by the London *Times* on Monday, August 28, in commenting on the new Dulles speech. The *Times* admitted that Israel had "built up the strongest Levantine fighting force outside Turkey" and that she had grasped at every apportunity to negotiate with the Arabs. The *Times*, often the unofficial voice of the Foreign Office, also admitted that the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 put Israel at a disadvantage, by preventing Israel from forcing a military showdown while enabling the Arab States to carry on an economic blockade against her. *But*—

"Alliance implies a high identify of interest," said the London *Times*, "and Britain's interest in the Middle East can be advanced now by alliance with the Arab States. They alone, however incompetent, unstable or unreliable, have the oil, occupy the territory, and provide air fields in sufficient dispersion for the function they fulfill. The use of the Israel Army and provision of a British base in Israel, valuable though these could be, would not compensate for this."

There are few informed people in the capital who do not believe that editorial pretty accurately reflects the real views of the State Department as well as the Foreign Office. It may help one to understand the Dulles speech and the fact that officially Britain endorsed the Dulles speech. For that speech does not offer Israel a military pact. It offers a security guarantee of her borders *if and when she has been able to reach an agreement with the Arab States on where those boundaries shall be.*

This, as the *Times* points out, really goes no further than Sir Anthony Eden went last April when he said that Britain would be prepared to "back up" any arrangements between Israel and the Arabs on frontiers, Jordan water and the Arab refugees. Since there is no prospect of such agreements between Israel and the Arabs, the Eden offer did not mean very much. As the London *Economist* said September 3, "An echo rings through from the old days when the mandatory was ready to execute any decision 'acceptable to both communities.'" Since the two communities—Arab and Jewish—could never agree, the mandatory never had to act.

Pie-In-The-Sky, Too?

Is this all there is to the Dulles offer, too? Is it only a pie-in-the-sky performance, designed to sweeten and confuse American Zionist opinion, and to give the Eisenhower Administration a talking point in the next election against the Democrats?

Perhaps. But there is one more factor in the situation, and this is the growing flirtation between Egypt and the Soviet bloc. There has been much speculation about Mr. Dulles's timing, and this has been attributed to a desire to speak in more friendly vein of Israel before the 1956 presidential campaign actually got underway. But the timing may also have to do with developments elsewhere.

Just two weeks before Mr. Dulles spoke, Egypt's "neutralist" Premier announced that he had accepted an invitation to visit Moscow next year. The friendlier tone of the Dulles speech toward Israel and its one new proposal—an international loan to Israel for resettlement of the Arab refugees—may also have been intended to make Cairo nervous.

(Next week: Washington, Moscow and the Arab League.)

One of Freedom's New Allies

Q. Did the German Generals want war?

A. The German Generals didn't want war in 1939. Their buildup was not scheduled to be completed until 1948. Goering was against the Polish war. Even Hitler didn't want war. He just wanted to regain Danzig and eliminate the Polish Corridor, which was an affront no German could accept. Britain could have prevented the war by putting a little pressure on the Poles. But Britain refused.

—How Hitler Could Have Won, Interview with Field Marshal Kesselring, U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 2

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Carl Braden Tells What Has Happened to The Others in the Louisville Case

That Negro Family, Target of the Dynamiters, Is Still Homeless

By Carl Braden

The plight of Andrew Wade IV and his family has been obscured by the concern over what happened to me and six other white people in the Kentucky sedition cases.

Wade is the young Negro veteran whom my wife and I helped to obtain a house in a so-called white subdivision near Louisville. The house was later dynamited by neighbors, but my wife and I and others were accused of conspiring to blow it up to achieve a political end.

Wade's house faded into the background during my trial and imprisonment. It was all but forgotten in the fight to raise the $40,000 bond that resulted in my release from prison after I had served a total of 8 months. I was freed pending action on my 15-year sentence by the Kentucky Court of Appeals.

Many have sympathized with me because I had to serve those 8 months, but it is the Negro people in the South who merit the most concern. They have been in prison for 300 years and are just now beginning to see a chance to get out. Wade's house is a symbol of their struggle. It stands as a monument to the inhumanity of those who would stop desegregation in the schools by block desegregation in housing.

No House, No Money

The house lies half in ruins because Circuit Court is holding the money paid by the insurance company to repair the bomb damage. It is surrounded by tall grass and plastered with "No Trespassing" signs, erected by county policemen who did not take the trouble to prevent its being dynamited in June, 1954.

The court was able to place the money in escrow because the building and loan association had sued to foreclose on the mortgage. The insurance company said it did not know who was entitled to the money because title to the property was in dispute. This despite the fact that Wade bought the policy and paid the premiums.

Meantime, Wade is desperate. He still has no place to live. He and his wife and their two children, 4-year-old Rosemary and Andrea, a year old, are sharing the home of Wade's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Wade, Jr. Young Wade pointed out to the *Louisville Defender* recently that he and his family are bunking up like refugees while the people who blew up his house remain free of prosecution.

Wade tried to buy another house in a new Negro subdivision, but lending institutions turned thumbs down. He had to seek a house with a very low down payment because he still has $1,400 tied up in the bombed house.

Then he bought a house that was to be torn down to make way for a turnpike. He paid $100 down and put up a $300 bond to insure that it would be moved by a certain date. All kinds of blocks were thrown up by the mover and the man who was selling Wade a lot to put the house on. They suddenly wanted more money than they ordinarily would. The deadline for removal passed and the house was torn down. Wade's $400 went, too.

Other innocent victims of this persecution are our two children, Jimmy, almost 4, and Anita, 2½. Just about every other day Jimmy says to me or my wife, "Please don't go away in the night."

We were torn from the children last October 1 when we were indicted on charges of advocating sedition. The indictment was returned at night and we were taken away and put in the county jail. I did not see Jim and Anita until November 5. They were staying with Anne's parents in Anniston, Ala. We arrived to visit them that morning. In the afternoon, the grand jury at Louisville indicted us again—this time on the charge of conspiring to blow up Wade's house.

Anne and I had to leave Anniston that night in order to drive the 400 miles to Louisville and be in court the next morning. Jimmy, a brave little boy, did not say much at that time. But the experience left deep scars.

The Other Defendants

The plight of the other defendants has also been obscured by the concentration on my case. Their trials have all been postponed pending the outcome of my appeal. All are free on bond.

I. O. Ford, who spent his 80th birthday in jail, was enfeebled by over six months' imprisonment and is ill quite a bit. He was unable to supply the $10,000 bail set after his indictment and was not freed until the bond was cut to $3,000. He is living on Social Security benefits, such as they are.

Vernon Bown, a former seaman and truck driver who made pretty good money, is working as a mechanic at a service station—when there is work. Some weeks he makes all of $28. He spent 5 months in jail because of the excessive bail.

Miss LaRue Spiker, a social worker, is trying to live by making leather goods, doing mimeographing, and stuffing envelopes. Miss Louise Gilbert, considered one of the top social workers in Louisville, is working with the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in Philadelphia. The local branch of the W.I.L., of which she was an officer, dissolved as a result of the terror created by the sedition indictments and my prosecution.

Lewis Lubka worked for a photographer 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, until the boss cut his meager pay 20 per cent. He now plans to go to work as a welder's assistant. He was formerly a shop steward for IUE-CIO at the General Electric plant here.

Hopes for Jobless Compensation

Anne and I are living on loans and contributions from friends and relatives. I am also hoping to get unemployment compensation. I was a copy reader on the Louisville Courier-Journal at $120 a week.

The defendants figure that this case has cost them upwards of $20,000 and that it will cost at least another $5,000 just to perfect my appeal.

But they figure it is worth it. They feel that the world will be a better place to live in because they stood and fought for civil rights and civil liberties in 1954 and 1955. Each of them contributed in one way or another to the Wade's fight to live in the house of their choice. That was why they were persecuted.

An Item the New York Times Did Not Think News Fit to Print

Senator Finds Soviet Bloc Different From State Dept. Briefing

"Vienna, Sept. 1 (AP).—U. S. Senator Allen J. Ellender (D.-La.), said here today that he favors greater trade and more exchanges of delegations between the U. S. and Russia. Returning to the West from visits to Poland, Russia, Romania and Hungary, Sen. Ellender told a Vienna press conference:

"'My trip was a revelation to me. It was far different from the impression I had gained from the U. S. State Department. I saw enough and talked to enough people to gather the impression that they do not want war. They are suspicious of us, however, and believe we want war.'"

—N. Y. Herald-Tribune, Sept. 2, P. 2.

"Vienna, Sept. 1 (UP)—Senator Allen J. Ellender, Democrat of Louisiana, left today for Yugoslavia where he will talk with President Tito on general world affairs."

—N. Y. Times, Sept. 2, P. 6.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No Disarmament Agreement, But The Arms Race Is Slowing Down

The Government Decides It Cannot Get A New Lamont Indictment

RETREAT? On September 2 the government served notice that it would appeal Federal District Judge Edward Weinfeld's decision throwing out the indictments of Corliss Lamont, Albert Shadowitz and Abraham Unger for contempt of the McCarthy committee. The Judge ruled the indictments invalid because they failed to show that the McCarthy "Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations" had ever been properly authorized by resolution of the Senate or the full committee. Senator Mundt in a letter to Brownell demanded that the three men be indicted again, but a new indictment would still be invalid unless the government could find some law or resolution authorizing that McCarthy subcommittee. Apparently neither the Senate committee nor the Department of Justice were able to find such a resolution. Had they found one, it would have been easy to obtain a new indictment. The government has been forced to appeal instead, though reversal of the Weinfeld decision is very unlikely. Should the Weinfeld ruling be upheld on appeal, it would invalidate all other outstanding indictments for contempt of the McCarthy committee, including Harvey O'Connor's, which should go to trial here in Washington this Fall. . . .

DISARMAMENT: There will be no arms agreement. U. S. policy is set on atomic weapons. Russia's offer last May to accept Western terms for reduction of conventional armies in return for a ban on atom bombs is therefore being hastily swept under the rug at the New York talks. The Eisenhower plan for a pie-in-the-sky swap of all secrets is a propaganda "out" to hide this reality. *But* general reductions in armies and arms budgets are already underway without agreement. A slowing down of the arms race has begun.

JAPAN: Dulles, pro-Axis before the war, still sees the Far East as a Japanese "co-prosperity sphere" in which Japan would become the main supplier for East Asia and its policeman against Communism. This is what lies behind that high-sounding reference in the Dulles-Shigemitsu statement on establishing conditions whereby Japan can "as rapidly as possible . . . be able to contribute to the preservation of international peace and security in the Western Pacific." This, which has already provoked protest in Japan, would require more than defensive forces. The Dulles program was undercut by one of those American radicals whom Shigemitsu visited in New York two days after. "Russia's attitude toward Japan," he told Shigemitsu, "will be one of defense against her, but not one of aggression so long as Japan avoids anything in the way of an aggressive position," (NY *Herald Tribune*, Sept. 3). This subversive adviser, now living underground at the Waldorf Astoria, was General MacArthur.

FOOTNOTES ON THE THAW: Our nomination for Remark of the Year: An Associated Press reporter in Moscow covering the throngs of foreign tourist moving through the Kremlin heard an American youth with a white sport shirt and a big "USA" badge say, "This place is crawling with capitalists." (*Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 3). . . . John O'Donnell (*New York Daily News*, Sept. 7), mournfully noting Senator Malone's (R., Nev.) friendly statements in Moscow, recalls elegaically that McCarthy, Malone and McCarran were the "three most dedicated anti-Communist members of the Senate" and asks in alarm "If Molly has been softened up in Moscow, is it safe to let any of our legislators visit the Soviet Union?" . . . The *London Times Literary Supplement* (Aug. 5) includes a special Autumn number on "Writing Abroad." The articles on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe show increasing freedom for writers since the death of Stalin but the survey of literature in Communist China shows Peking is still in the throes of the sectarian Communist tendency toward close political control of writers and intellectuals. . . .

Something New in Secrecy

Washington—A scientist employed by the government was called in by Army officials last year as he was about to leave for an international conference held out West and warned, "There's going to be a certain number of persons at this conference who are subversive and we don't want you to associate with them."

The scientist, anxious to keep out of trouble, asked who these subversives were so that he could watch out for them. "We're not allowed to tell you," was the answer he got. "But we want you to know that you'll be watched."

No Doubt Tortured Into Writing His Mother Regularly

"The mother of an American who's been in Red China for seven years said today she's been hearing from him regularly. Mrs. Thomas D. Miner, of 611 Ethan Allen Ave., Takoma Park, yesterday heard the good news that the Chinese Communist will give an exit permit to Charles Sydney Miner, 48. . . .

"Mrs. Miner, a widow, said letters used to come from her son every week or 10 days. And he always telephoned on holidays and her birthday, she said."

—Washington Daily News, Sept. 7.

We'll Be Glad to Send Free Sample Copies of Any Issue to Your Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**..... **State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**..... **State**.....

*** $1 extra for Canada.** 9/12/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S. E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED